

**REMARKS**

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action mailed on July 18, 2006 as well as the art cited. Claims 1, 8, 12, 14, 19, 20, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31 and 37 are currently amended by this response. Claims 17, 23, 24, 29 and 36 are canceled. Claims 1-6, 8, 12, 14-16, 19-22, 25, 27-28, 30-35, 37, and 39-43 are pending in this application.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 17, 19, 24, 25, 27, 36, and 37 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses these objections.

Claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 17 and any intervening claims, and is allowable for at least that reason. Accordingly, claim 17 has been canceled. Claim 19 has been amended to depend on and further define claim 14, and is allowable for at least that reason. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim 20 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 24 and any intervening claims, and is allowable for at least that reason. Accordingly, claims 23 and 24 have been canceled. Claims 25 and 27 have been amended to depend on and further define claim 20, and is allowable for at least that reason. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim 28 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 36, which the Examiner has indicated as allowable subject matter, and is allowable for at least that reason. Accordingly, claims 29 and 36 have been canceled. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim 8 has been amended to include the subject matter from claim 37, which the Examiner has indicated as allowable subject matter, and is allowable for at least that reason. Claims 37, as amended, depends on and further define claim 8, and is allowable for at least that reason. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 12 has been amended to provide “the pattern of illuminated indicators” which is provided sufficient antecedent basis from the amended Claim 8, which was amended to provide “a pattern of illuminated indicators”. Claim 12, either directly or indirectly, depends on and further defines Claim 8, which is allowable for the reason discussed above. Therefore, Claim 12 is allowable for at least that reason. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5, 6, 20-22, 28, 32-35 and 42 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Faivre (U.S. Patent No. 5,661,486). Applicant traverses these rejections.

With respect to Claim 1, the claim has been amended to include the allowable subject matter indicated by the Examiner with respect to claims 24 and 37. As amended, Claim 1 provides “a means for interpreting the signal output by the means for outputting as a pattern of illuminated indicators on a cockpit display, wherein the pattern of illuminated indicators simulates a known airport lighting aid.” Faivre fails to teach “a pattern of illuminated indicators on a cockpit display, wherein the pattern of illuminated indicators simulates a known airport lighting aid” as provided in amended Claim 1. The Applicant asserts that Faivre fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 1 and for that reason, Claim 1 is not anticipated by Faivre and is allowable for at least that reason. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 5-6 and 42, either directly or indirectly, depend on and further define Claim 1 and are allowable for at least that reason. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With respect to Claim 20, the claim has been amended to include the allowable limitations of claim 24 and any intervening claims. As amended, Claim 20 provides a “sixth computer-readable program code means for interpreting the signal output by the fifth computer-readable program code means as a pattern of color coded indicators on a cockpit display, wherein the pattern of display indicators simulates a known airport lighting aid.” Faivre fails to teach “means for interpreting the signal output by the fifth computer-readable program code means as a pattern of color coded indicators on a cockpit display, wherein the pattern of display indicators simulates a known airport lighting aid” as provided in amended Claim 20. The Applicant asserts that Faivre fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 20 and for that reason, Claim 20 is not anticipated by Faive and is allowable for at least that reason. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 21-22, either directly or indirectly, depend on and further define Claim 20 and are allowable for at least that reason. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With respect to Claim 28, the claim has been amended to include the limitations of claim 36, which the Examiner has indicated as allowable subject matter. As amended, claim 28 provides “visually displaying the deviation from the glide path as a function of the deviation signal, wherein visually displaying the deviation includes displaying an illuminated indicator indicating the degree of deviation from the glide path positioned relative to a pattern of illuminated indicators simulating a known airport lighting aid.” Faivre fails to teach or suggest “displaying an illuminated indicator indicating the degree of deviation from the glide path positioned relative to a pattern of illuminated indicators simulating a known airport lighting aid.” The Applicant asserts that Faivre fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 28 and for that reason, Claim 28 is not anticipated by Faive and is allowable for at least that reason. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Because Claims 32-35, either directly or indirectly, depend on and further define Claim 28, they are allowable for at least that reason. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-4, 8, 14-16, 23, 29-31, 39-41, and 43 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faivre (U.S. Patent No. '486) in view of Barrows et al., "Operational Experience with and Improvements to a Tunnel-in-the-Sky Display for Light Aircraft," (1997). Applicant traverses these rejections.

With respect to Claims 2-4, these Claims either directly or indirectly, depend on and further define Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter indicated by the Examiner with respect to claims 24 and 37. As amended, Claim 1 provides "a means for interpreting the signal output by the means for outputting as a pattern of illuminated indicators on a cockpit display, wherein the pattern of illuminated indicators simulates a known airport lighting aid." Faivre and Barrows et al., either alone or in combination, fail to teach "a pattern of illuminated indicators on a cockpit display, wherein the pattern of illuminated indicators simulates a known airport lighting aid" as provided in amended Claim 1, and Claim 1 is allowable for at least that reason. Claims 5-6, either directly or indirectly, depend on and further define Claim 1 and are allowable for at least that reason. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With respect to Claim 8, the claim has been amended to include the subject matter from claim 37, which the Examiner has indicated as allowable subject matter. As amended, Claim 8 provides "an on-board display structured to receive the signal output by the signal generator and responsively output a visual indication of the degree of coincidence with the glide path, wherein a pattern of illuminated indicators are positioned simulating a known airport lighting aid." Faivre and Barrows et al., either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "wherein a pattern of

illuminated indicators are positioned simulating a known airport lighting aid.” Therefore, Claim 8 is allowable for at least that reason. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 12, 14-16, 37, 39-41 and 43, either directly or indirectly, depend on and further define Claim 8, and are allowable for at least that reason. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

With respect to Claim 23, Claim 23 has been canceled for the reasons discussed above with respect to the amendment of Claim 20. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

With respect to Claim 29, Claim 29 has been canceled for the reasons discussed above with respect to the amendment of Claim 28. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

With respect to Claims 30 and 31, the Claims have been amended to depend on and further define Claim 28. Claim 28 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 36, which the Examiner has indicated as allowable subject matter. As amended, claim 28 provides “visually displaying the deviation from the glide path as a function of the deviation signal, wherein visually displaying the deviation includes displaying an illuminated indicator indicating the degree of deviation from the glide path positioned relative to a pattern of illuminated indicators simulating a known airport lighting aid.” Faivre and Barrows et al., either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “displaying an illuminated indicator indicating the degree of deviation from the glide path positioned relative to a pattern of illuminated indicators simulating a known airport lighting aid” and Claim 28 is allowable for at least that reason. Because Claims 30 and 31, either directly or indirectly, depend on and further define Claim 28, they are allowable for at least that reason. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/052,716

Filing Date: 01/17/2002

Attorney Docket No. H001799-5542

Title: SIMULATED VISUAL GLIDESLOPE INDICATOR ON AIRCRAFT DISPLAY


---

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-6, 8, 12, 14-16, 19-22, 25, 27-28, 30-35, 37, and 39-43 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 455-1687.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/17/2006  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J. Patrick Kendrick  
Reg. No. 53,109

Attorneys for Applicant  
Fogg and Associates, LLC  
P.O. Box 581339  
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339  
T – (612) 332-4720  
F – (612) 332-4731